

NOTICE: All slip opinions and orders are subject to formal revision and are superseded by the advance sheets and bound volumes of the Official Reports. If you find a typographical error or other formal error, please notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Judicial Court, John Adams Courthouse, 1 Pemberton Square, Suite 2500, Boston, MA, 02108-1750; (617) 557-1030; SJCReporter@sjc.state.ma.us

SJC-13104

HAMID REZA ARDANEH vs. COMMONWEALTH.¹

July 1, 2021.

Supreme Judicial Court, Superintendence of inferior courts.

The petitioner, Hamid Reza Ardaneh, filed papers in the county court that included what appears to be a request for relief pursuant to G. L. c. 211, § 3. The papers also included, among other things, copies of documents directed to at least two different departments of the Trial Court as well as the United States Supreme Court, all of which also seem to be seeking some sort of unspecified relief. It is not clear whether those particular papers were also filed in the other courts. Although Ardaneh asked this court to exercise its general superintendence power pursuant to G. L. c. 211, § 3, he did not identify, in any discernible way, the specific relief sought. On the basis that it was unclear what relief Ardaneh was seeking, the single justice denied the petition.

Ardaneh fares no better in his appeal to this court. He has filed what appears to be intended as a memorandum and appendix pursuant to S.J.C. Rule 2:21, as amended, 434 Mass. 1301 (2001), but it is not clear that the rule applies (because it is not clear that he is challenging any interlocutory ruling of a trial court). Regardless of whether rule 2:21 applies, however, what is clear is that Ardaneh is not entitled to relief on this record. As he has done before, he appears to be challenging the trial court proceedings generally and various unspecified rulings therein. See Ardaneh v. Commonwealth, 486

¹ Certain individuals associated with Bridgewater State Hospital; certain individuals associated with the trial court; and others.

Mass. 1005, 1005-1006 (2020). As we stated in his earlier case, to the extent that Ardaneh seeks relief "from what he perceive[s] to be general injustices done to or imposed on him" in the trial court, "[h]is claims [do] not present a situation warranting extraordinary superintendence relief directly from this court." Id. at 1006. If anything about Ardaneh's circumstances has changed since the time of his previous appeal, those changes are not evidenced in the record before us.

The single justice did not err or abuse his discretion in denying relief.

Judgment affirmed.

The case was submitted on the papers filed, accompanied by a memorandum of law.

Hamid Reza Ardaneh, pro se.